

avarice and ambition. Now, Mr. Editor, I feel perfectly safe in saying that no man will be elected by the Quebec synod as their future Bishop, whose known character is not far superior to the imputations of such motives as these.

I have not time to follow up the subject; nor yet to look up a mass of precedents, showing the use of the Anglican Church alone, which is all we at present have to do with, for a thousand years at any rate. And surely it needs none. That this is the recognized use of the Anglican Church will hardly be denied. And if so, is this a time to press for changes? A cry of this kind may be convenient, and perhaps effective, for electioneering purposes,—it may help to clear the ground of dangerous rivals to a favorite candidate; but for a measure of reform, an opportunity for fuller consideration of more constitutional introduction should be afforded. I have not spoken of your correspondent's reference to a Provincial synod as a suitable means anciently enjoined for ratifying an act of translation; because the main point is the question of translation considered in itself. This last being conceded—if "a Delegate" has strong convictions on this subject of ratification, let him by all means bring them before the Provincial Synod itself, and introduce a canon to this effect. There can be no possible objection to his doing so. But in the meantime let him not visit upon others the blame due to his own neglect to take this step in the past. Until the case has thus been provided for, let him not blame people for failing to avail themselves of a provision which does not yet exist.

And let such agitators beware lest in thus passing a judgment upon a Selwyn, a Wilberforce, a Harold Browne, a Walsham-How, nay, upon the excellent Primate of all England himself, and his many predecessors,—they be found even fighting against God. F. J. B. ALLNATT.

Lennoxville, 20th May, 1892.

Chancel Windows to Give Away.

SIR,—I have three lancet windows, two about 6 ft. x 14½ in. and one about 7 ft. x 25 in., removed to give place to stained glass, which I will give to any church in need of them. Each window is composed of two sashes filled with plain glass, frosted; but they are neat and as good as new.

A. K. GRIFFIN.

Trinity Church Parsonage, Bulford.

Bishop's College.

SIR,—Permit me to correct a slight error which has crept into your otherwise correct report of the Eastertide meeting of the Corporation of Bishop's College, in your issue of May 19th.

It is reported:—"It was also stated that enough promises had been secured to assure its speedy internal completion." These words do not refer to the chapel, as would be inferred from your report, but to the Divinity House, of which they are fortunately true. The chapel still requires at least \$3,000 more to complete it and possibly even more, for the foundations are found to be more injured by the fire than had hitherto been supposed.

Trusting you will find space to make this correction, and to say that we shall be grateful for help in the matter of our chapel restoration.

THOS. ADAMS.

Bishop's College, Lennoxville, May 20th, 1892.

Unfermented Wine.

SIR,—We must express our regret at the opening of your pages for even the discussion of "Unfermented Wine." Wine, if wine at all, is fermented, but syrup or molasses can never be wine in any true sense of the word. The fermentation is a most wholesome, natural process, and an essential to the juice of the grape. The rabbi must have had a decided vein of humor in him if he made the reported statement to the editor of the London Methodist Times: a good many wise men cannot see a joke, and evidently the rabbi knew what information was wanted. But the whole story has a syrupy look about it, and a good Churchman will not make his sacrament in a decoction of "old Malaga or Muscatel raisins," even though the best part of it is the "one quart of water boiled gently down to one pint!" It may be that those who go in for the "Unfermented Wine" notion are themselves, and their sacramental form, no better or no worse, but the rule and practice in the Church are clear, and happily even the weakest among our clergy has no option.

NOBODY.

May 26th, 1892.

Translation and Importation of Bishops.

SIR,—I read the article in the issue of May 12th on the "Translation and Importation of Bishops" by "a Delegate," at first with some amusement at

its effrontery—then with indignation at its evident malice. I think the members of the Quebec Synod may fairly ask who is this person, styling himself "a Delegate," who presumes to lecture the Bishops on their obligations, and to admonish them to resist pecuniary temptations. I have known something of the past history of the Bishops referred to, and should certainly have considered them above suspicion of being influenced by any worldly considerations. No doubt "a Delegate" is quite in the confidence of Canon DuMoulin, but I must express a doubt as to whether he is authorized to state so positively that "he probably would not accept the position." It is difficult to see why the Canon's name is dragged in at all.

I would be glad to know what "a Delegate" means by these words with which he concludes his valuable (?) article: "and not run the risk of importing into the Canadian Episcopate another 'Higher criticism' sceptic, or a fossilized Englishman, who will be too old to learn the sentiments of the Canadian people." What Bishop have we had, or have we now, who could be described as either a "Higher criticism" sceptic, or a fossilized Englishman?

ANOTHER DELEGATE.

P. Q., May 25th, 1892.

Notes and Queries.

SIR,—1. In an argument with a Presbyterian, I found that the Presbyterian claimed the having the Three Orders of the Ministry (Ministers, Elders and Deacons), and that these three corresponded to our orders of Bishop, Priest and Deacon, and are equal to them. Is this a fair argument? If so, what can I say, and if not, how can I prove its unfairness?

2. What is the Presbyterian Liturgy, and how long has that church had one?

COLLINGWOOD.

Ans.—Your query points to a fuller answer than its words request.

1. Presbyterianism is not Scotch, but Genevan: not from John Knox, but from Andrew Melville; not from Scriptural or Apostolic times, but from the Reformation period: having no authoritative documents of its own, but going for them to Westminster and the English Puritans: being in no sense a religious body, but owing all it has to the Erastian William, who took it under his royal wing when the Scotch bishops were requiring a little time for mutual consultation. A *fad* of the present generation is the question of presbyterial succession as being at least equivalent to the Episcopal or Apostolic. In reply we say, lay aside assumptions from ignorance, and give a reasonable proof by pointing to a reference to its once being thought of in the 10th, 5th, 2nd or 1st century. Controversy was common in the early ages of the Church, but it never touched the episcopal functions, and we well may ask when, how, and where there is even a hint that the Episcopal was supplanted by the Presbyterian. In other words, both the Scripture and the Church for fourteen hundred years knew nothing of Presbyterianism, and everything about Episcopacy. As to Three Orders, with us they are as closely connected as the root, the stem, and the leaf; in Presbyterianism, there is no organic union, but a set of names which any club may assume, and which the Catholic Apostolics extend even farther than the Presbyterians; cherubim and seraphim are as fully Scriptural names, but what then? The question of the names is unfair because it has no historical basis, and is practically an innovation. Mere assertion is nothing, and the appeal to Scripture words and phrases is nothing.

2. Presbyterians never had a Liturgy. For a few years past attempts have been made to compile one, but the Presbyterian tradition of extemporising is too strong as yet for any good results in this direction. The *Euchologion* was the first sample. Knox's Liturgy or "The Book of Common Order" is scarcely a Liturgy at all, but rather a Directory for Worship. The Books of Discipline were certainly not liturgical. And how will the Established, Free and United Presbyterian bodies in Scotland ever agree upon anything of the kind? But until they all agree there can be nothing having the semblance of a Presbyterian Liturgy. In Canada they appear to have agreed to a sinking of all differences, and to becoming one body. But in Scotland there is a large proportion of Presbyterians who are longing for some form of Liturgy, as they have ceased to regard extemporising as a praying with the Spirit when the understanding is so often adrift, and recourse is so often had to scraps from the Book of Common Prayer.

It is not theory but fact—that Hood's Sarsaparilla makes the weak strong. A fair trial will convince you of its merit.

Sunday School Lesson.

Whit-Sunday.

June 5th, 1892.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

The great festival which we celebrate to-day is sometimes called *Whitsun-Day* (derived from the German), and signifies the same as the corresponding Jewish Festival of Pentecost, being the fiftieth day from Easter or the Passover; but more commonly *Whit-Sunday*, from the white garments worn on this day in the early Church by the newly baptized. Or possibly it refers to the outpouring of wisdom (in Ang. Sax. "wit") on the Apostles.

"I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY GHOST."

In the Creed we have already spoken of two Persons, the Father and the Son. We generally, in mentioning the Trinity, say "The Holy Ghost" last; but this is not because He is inferior (See Athanasian Creed.) This is the order given in the form of Baptism (S. Matt. xxviii. 19.)

(1.) *Meaning of Name.*—"Ghost" or "Spirit" same in its derivation as "breath." (See Gen. ii. 7.) So He is called in the Nicene Creed, "Giver of (spiritual) life." Also called "Holy," because He sanctifies (makes holy) the people of God.

(2.) *Not a visible, but a real Person.* Foolish stories of seeing ghosts. No spirit can ever be seen by our earthly eyes. The Lord Jesus was visible when on earth, because He had a human Body. The Holy Ghost never seen by mortals—though there is a heavenly or spiritual eyesight, by which we hope hereafter to see God, face to face. The Holy Ghost is invisible, but He has appeared in a bodily shape (a dove, St. Matt. iii. 16; tongues of fire, Acts ii. 3). Though invisible, none the less a real Person. (Many things are invisible which we know are real, as wind, electricity, our souls, our life, etc.) The Bible constantly speaks of the Holy Ghost as a real Person—for example, the form of Baptism (S. Matt. xxviii. 19; compare 1 Cor. xiii. 14). As a person He *strives* (Gen. vi. 3). *Comforts* (S. John xiv. 16-17), *is offended* (Acts v. 3), *grieved* (Eph. iv. 30).

(3.) *The Work of the Holy Ghost.* We have already seen that His work for us is implied in His Name (Sanctifier, Giver of Life), but we shall gain a larger knowledge of His wonderful power over human hearts and souls by considering—

II. THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

"The Promised Comforter" is the subject of the Bible Lesson, and it is not necessary to speak here of the circumstances under which the coming of that great blessing was announced to the Apostles.

(1.) The Church may properly be said to have had its beginning when the Holy Ghost descended at Pentecost (Acts ii. 1, etc.). The Apostles were not to begin their missionary work till the promise was fulfilled (Acts i. 4). The Church began that day with one hundred and twenty souls (Acts i. 15), but after S. Peter had spoken under the influence of the Holy Ghost, there were added the same day about three thousand more (ii. 41). (Note that the same Apostle, before the Spirit was given, had basely denied his Lord.)

(2.) *Gifts of the Spirit.* The miraculous gifts received at Pentecost were one of the greatest causes of the marvellous growth of the Church in the time of the Apostles. They are enumerated in 1 Cor. xii. 8-10. The Apostles had also the power of communicating the Holy Ghost to others by the laying on of hands. (Acts viii. 17.) And those on whom they laid their hands received miraculous powers. (Acts xix. 6.)

We have the benefit of these supernatural powers in the Holy Scriptures, which were written by inspiration of the Holy Ghost (2 Peter i. 21).

(3.) The miraculous gifts were only intended for the earliest age of the Church. But better and more enduring blessings still remain. (See 1 Cor. xii. 31, which introduces the beautiful passage on Faith, Hope, and Charity in the next chapter.) We learn from Rom. viii. that we receive from the Holy Spirit *life*, both here (v. 10) and after death (v. 11); *adoption* into God's family (vv. 14 to 17); the *power to pray* (v. 26). Other *fruits of the Spirit* are spoken of in Gal. v. 22.

(4.) The Holy Ghost is given at Baptism, renewed at Confirmation, and most plentifully outpoured in Holy Communion. He gives us a lifelong intercourse with the Blessed Saviour (S. John xiv. 16, 18). We may say in a word, that while the Lord Jesus obtained for us the unspeakable blessings of the Christian religion, those blessings are all communicated to us through the Holy Ghost.

—God sometimes mercifully makes use of death or sorrow to wake up sleeping consciences. The sudden death of a companion, a great change of fortune, has been the turning-point in many lives. God sends a strong remedy when He sees that nothing else will work a cure.